

STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1022A 33 DYTH

Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested



RDMS DocID

107330

January 6, 2008

Mr. William Buckham, Vice President & Assistant General Counsel General Counsel, Electronic Banking Services Division CheckFree 4411 East Jones Bridge Road Norcross, GA 30092

RE:

Former CEE/InteliData facility

80 Pickett District Road, New Milford, CT.

Dear Mr. Buckham:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT DEP) are pleased to inform you that, based on review of the existing available data on the former CEE/InteliData facility, we have determined that the facility has achieved the RCRA Corrective Action goal of Stabilization. The purpose of this letter is to formally acknowledge this achievement and to communicate the Agencies' expectations that further progress be made in the implementation of the RCRA Corrective Action Program at the facility, including evaluation of a full set of site-wide corrective measures and completion of construction and installation of all required remedial actions.

EPA and CT DEP consider Stabilization as the achievement of the two RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicators (EIs), Current Human Exposures Under Control (RCRIS code CA725) and Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control (CA750). EPA has reviewed the EI evaluations prepared by Environmental Resource Management (ERM) on behalf of the former CEE/InteliData facility. Based on currently available data and analyses and knowledge of the nature and extent of the contamination, we agree that a "YE" (yes) for both indicators has been achieved at the facility. Completed EI evaluations for the former CEE/InteliData facility are enclosed. Please note that the EIs are an interim goal based on current conditions. Any new information (e.g., a change in facility operations, new results of groundwater monitoring revealing that the migration of contaminated groundwater is no longer under control, or land use which results in a potential human health exposure scenario) could affect these determinations.

Facilities such as yours will also be expected to make a site wide remedy decision and to complete construction of the corrective measures set out in the site-wide remedy decision. Both the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Corrective Action, dated Wednesday, May 1, 1996, Volume 61, pages 19432-19464 Corrective Action for Releases From Solid Waste Management Units at Hazardous Waste Management Facilities; Proposed Rule and the Federal Register notice dated February 25, 2003, entitled Final Guidance on Completion of Corrective Action Activities at RCRA Facilities are currently the best references for site-wide remedies under the RCRA Corrective Action Program. These documents are available on the following page of EPA's website: http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/hazard/correctiveaction/resources/index.htm.

Within 60 days of the date of this letter, please provide an overall site schedule to CT DEP and EPA, including target dates by which you expect to have 1) made a site-wide remedy decision at the subject facility and 2) completed construction of the corrective measures set out in the site-wide remedy decision. In addition, please include scheduled dates for the planning, execution, and reporting of any tasks necessary toward achievement of site-wide remedy decision and completion of remedy construction.

Mr. William Buckham, CheckFree January 6, 2008

"Overall protection of human health and the environment"; is the first of four threshold criteria used for evaluating site-wide remedies in the RCRA Corrective Action program. Therefore, any environmental and human health risks posed by site contaminants must be understood prior to making a site-wide remedy decision. Attached is the Ecological Receptor Exposure Pathway Scoping Checklist, developed by EPA Region I. The scoping checklist is a tool designed to identify any potential exposure pathways between site contaminants and ecological receptors (i.e., plants and wildlife). Completion of the scoping checklist can therefore serve as a first step in evaluating ecological risk. If potential exposure pathways are identified through completion of the checklist, an EPA or CT DEP ecological risk assessor should be consulted regarding whether additional work is necessary to evaluate risk. If no potential exposure pathways are identified through use of the checklist and EPA and CT DEP concur with this finding, the completed checklist can be used to document that ecological risks have been evaluated at the facility. Please complete the attached checklist using all available information for the former CEE/InteliData facility and provide the completed checklist to EPA and CT DEP within 90 days of the date of this letter.

Thank you for your continuing commitment to environmental excellence. We look forward to your continued efforts to meet the goals of site-wide remedy decision and remedy construction complete. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Stephanie Carr of EPA at 617/918-1363 or Gennady Shteynberg of CT DEP at 860/424-3283

Sincerely,

Manuel College

Stephanie Carr

RCRA Facility Manager

RCRA Corrective Action, Office of Site Remediation and Restoration

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region I

One Congress Street - Suite 1100

Boston, MA 02114-2023

Gennady (Gene) Shteynberg Environmental Analyst 3

Remediation Division, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse State of Connecticut

Department of Environmental Protection

79 Elm Street

Hartford, CT 06106-5127

Enclosures

cc:

B. Drake, ERM

K, King, ERM

A. Davis, Dewey & LeBoeuf, LLP

e of Connecticut								
52	U.S. Postal Service (CERTIFIED MAIL) RECEIPT (Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)							
6 6	For delivery information visit our website at www.usps.com.;							
_	OFF	* ************************************	C	THE REAL PROPERTY.	A	Target, all	JUSE	
756	Postage	\$						
	Certifled Fee	}						
0000 0	Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)						Postmark Here	
	Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)							
122	Total Postage & Fees	\$				_		
7007	Sont To Mr. William Buckham, Check Free							
70	Street, Apt. No.: 4411 East Jones Bridge Rd.							
City, State, ZIP+4 Nos rucus GA 30097					3m9 ž			

2

EPA – New England Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Ecological Receptor Exposure Pathway Scoping Checklist

Facility Name: Facility Address:	 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 	
Facility EPA ID #:				
· ·			 	

Purpose:

This checklist is designed as a screening tool to help EPA-New England (EPA-NE) RCRA Corrective Action project managers determine whether there is the potential for complete exposure pathways between RCRA facility contaminants and ecological receptors (i.e., plants and wildlife).

Intended Use:

EPA-NE has recognized a need for a tool to guide its review of facility information pertaining to ecological risk assessment. This checklist is intended to guide EPA-NE review of available information on environmental conditions at a facility to determine whether further ecological assessment is necessary. Ideally, the checklist should be completed early in the RCRA Corrective Action process. If complete ecological exposure pathways are identified, an EPA or state ecological risk assessor should be involved in planning subsequent site investigation and ecological risk assessment.

Some state environmental agencies in New England have developed, or are in the process of developing, their own checklists or other tools for scoping ecological exposure pathways. Although EPA-NE believes the use of this checklist may be comparable and complimentary to other existing scoping tools used by states, the format and content of this EPA-NE checklist may differ from such state tools. Accordingly, this checklist is designed primarily for use by EPA-NE RCRA Facility Managers and their agents.

The checklist is considered a public document and, once completed for a given facility, may be included in the facility file. As a public document, the checklist may be shared with states, the regulated community, or the public for informational purposes.

Instructions:

All available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected contaminant releases at or from the facility to soil, groundwater, surface water/sediments should be considered in completing this checklist.

Each page of the checklist includes a series of questions to be answered by the project manager completing the checklist. In the "rationale and reference" section on each

page, the project manager should summarize the supporting information used to answer the questions and clearly reference the document, as well as the page number, table number or figure number, where the supporting data can be found. Rationale and references should be clear and specific so that the findings of the checklist are transparent and able to be reproduced. Based on the answers to the questions on each page, the project manager can complete the "Preliminary Ecological Risk Evaluation" section of the checklist.

If the answer to any of the questions in the Preliminary Ecological Risk Evaluation section is "yes", the project manager should consult a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or state ecological risk assessor for further information. In this case, an ecological risk assessor should be involved as early as possible in planning the site investigation and further ecological risk assessment. If the answer is "no" to all three findings in the Preliminary Ecological Risk Evaluation section, complete pathways for contaminant exposure to ecological receptors are not reasonably expected at the facility, based on the data used in completing the checklist. Following its completion, the checklist should be included in the facility file to document the rationale for consulting an ecological risk assessor and focusing any subsequent ecological risk assessment, or the rationale for not proceeding further with ecological risk assessment.

Note. Please be advised that new data or new information could alter the findings of this checklist. The checklist should be revisited if new information that might change the checklist findings becomes available. Completion of this checklist is not intended to substitute for a Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA) or a Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA). Findings, documented by this checklist that ecological exposure to facility contaminants is not expected, are not considered final until a site-wide remedy decision made by EPA or a state environmental agency authorized for RCRA Corrective Action results in the termination of interim status of a facility or satisfaction with the conditions of a hazardous waste operating or post-closure permit

REVIEW OF FACILITY INFORMATION & CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL

In order for ecological risks to exist there must be a potential for exposure of ecological receptors to contaminants. This portion of the evaluation is designed to assist in the identification of contaminated environmental media associated with a site.

Based on a review of the file and an understanding of the conceptual site model for the facility, please identify the environmental media present on or adjacent to the facility property which are known or reasonably expected to be impacted by contaminants from the facility. Place a check mark next to the media type. Additionally, please evaluate the potential for migration of contaminants from the site. Potential migration pathways include surface water flow, run off, groundwater flow, erosion, placement of fill and discharge locations. Please attach a figure of the site showing areas of potential contamination.

Media Potentially Affected by Facility Operations:		Potential for Migration	Migration Pathways
	Soil	Yes_/No_	
	Sediment	Yes/No	
	Surface Water	Yes_/No_	
	Ground Water	Yes_/No_	

Rationale and References: (Please clearly reference the document name and date as well as the page, table or figure number where any data considered in answering the above questions can be found)

HABITAT DOCUMENTATION

In order for ecological risks to exist there must be a potential for ecological receptors to come into contact with contaminated media. This portion of the evaluation is designed to assist in the identification of potential presence of environmental receptors associated with a site. It is predicated upon the assumption that if suitable habitat exists, then ecological receptors could potentially be present.

Please check the potentially impacted habitats present on, adjacent to, or immediately downgradient of the facility based on a site visit and an understanding of the site conceptual model. Also, indicate for each habitat whether the presence of site-derived contamination has been confirmed, is suspected, is not expected, or is unknown

Table	e 1: Summar	y of habitats	and presence	of Site-deriv	ved contami	nation	
Habitat type Location			Presence of Site-derived contamination				
	At the site"	Adjacent to the site ^b	Not present	Con- firmed	Sus- pected	Not expected	Unknown
	M	ARINE/EST	UARINE EN	VIRONMEN	TS		
Salt marsh							
Tidal rivers & streams							
Exposed mudflats							
Seagrass beds							
Rocky shoreline							
Other*							
		FRESHWA'	TER ENVIR	ONMENTS			
Wetlands							
Lakes & ponds				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
Rivers and streams							
Vernal pools ^c							
Other*							
TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENTS							
Wooded	_						
Transitional							
Open field							
Other*							

^a "at the site" is defined as within the limits of the site perimeter or site fence

^b "adjacent to the site" is more loosely defined as terrestrial or aquatic habitat present in the immediate vicinity of the site

^c "vernal pool" refers to a temporary body of standing water often located in terrestrial habitat which appears in early spring but completely dries out by late spring-early summer. This type of habitat can be suitable and is critical for, among other things, amphibian reproduction.

^{*} provide additional details

Habitat Documentation Rationale and References: (Please clearly reference the document name and date as well as the page, table or figure number where any data considered in answering the above questions can be found.)

EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT

In order for there to be a potential for ecological risks to occur at a site, there must be a potential for stressors, in this case chemicals, to be present where ecological receptors could come in contact with them. After reviewing the previous pages on Facility Information and Habitat Documentation, plus additional facility information as necessary, please answer the following questions in order to determine if ecological receptors are known or could reasonably be expected to be exposed to contaminants at or from the facility. If any contaminant concentration data showing non-detect results are used to conclude that an environmental medium is not contaminated, please consult an ecological risk assessor to confirm that analytical methods used were adequate to detect contaminants at concentrations below levels of concern for ecological receptors. In addition, contaminants that have the potential to bioaccumulate cannot be eliminated from further consideration through the use of this checklist. Bioaccumulating contaminants must be carried through the ecological risk assessment.

Surface Water Bodies

Sediments

- 1 a. Is sediment in surface water bodies known or reasonably expected to be contaminated due to releases at or from the facility? Releases from a facility may include but are not limited to: point source discharges, run-off from contaminated soil, groundwater migration, erosion, filling or aerial deposition resulting from air emissions. Note: If sediment samples are taken adjacent to or downstream of the site, collection should take place in depositional areas present.
 - Yes (Complete the remaining questions in this checklist and circle "Yes" in Surface Water Body Finding under the PRELIMINARY **ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)**

No (Proceed to question 1b.)

Surface Water

- 1b. Is surface water known or reasonably expected to be contaminated due to releases at or from the facility? Releases from a facility may include but are not limited to: point source discharges, run-off from contaminated soil, discharge of contaminated groundwater, groundwater migration or aerial deposition resulting from air emissions. (Note: for surface water, dissolved metal data, from analysis of filtered water samples, is a better indicator of exposure than total metal data).
 - Yes (Complete the remaining questions in this checklist and circle "Yes" in Surface Water Body Finding under the PRELIMINARY **ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)**
 - No (Proceed to question 1c.)

Groundwater

1 c. For groundwater discharging to surface water, is groundwater, at the point of discharge to the surface water body, known or reasonably suspected to be contaminated due to releases at or from the facility? Note: Because of the ability of certain sediments to accumulate contaminants, the need for sediment sampling in a water body should not be ruled out based on concentrations of suspected site related contaminants found to be below ecologically based ambient surface water quality criteria in groundwater which intersects surface water bodies.

- Yes_ (Complete the Surface Water Bodies Rationale and References section and the remaining questions in this checklist. Then, circle "Yes" in the Surface Water Body Finding under the PRELIMINARY
 ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)
- No_ (Complete the Surface Water Bodies Rationale and References section directly below, then proceed to the Surface Soil Section below.)

Surface Water Bodies Rationale and References: (Please summarize the rationale for the answers provided in the "Surface Water Bodies" section above. Please clearly reference the document name and date as well as the page, table or figure number where any data considered in answering the above questions can be found. In addition, please discuss any site specific information, not specifically prompted by the question(s) above, that would help to clarify and/or qualify the finding.) Please add additional pages as necessary.

Surface Soil

2 a. Is surface soil (found at depths of 2 feet or less from the surface) known or reasonably expected to be contaminated due to releases at or from the facility?

Yes_ (Proceed to question 2 b.)

No___ (Complete the Surface Soil Rationale and References section and the remaining questions in this checklist, then circle "No" under Surface Soil Finding in the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)

2 b. Is <u>all</u> contaminated surface soil covered with buildings, pavement or other physical barriers that prevent plants or wildlife from being exposed to contaminants and that prevent migration of soil contamination into groundwater that could affect a surface water body?

Yes_ (Proceed to question 2 c.)

No_ (Complete the Surface Soil Rationale and References section below and the remaining questions in this checklist, then circle "Yes" under Surface Soil Finding in the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)

- 2 c. Is an institutional control in place to ensure the maintenance of the barriers described above so that receptors will not be exposed to contaminated soil (i.e., ensuring that soil will not be exposed as a result of excavation, demolition or other activities and that pavement or other physical barriers will be maintained in good condition and that if soil is exposed, appropriate measures will be taken to address any ecological risks).
 - Yes_ (After completing the Surface Soil Rationale and References section below and the remaining questions in this checklist, circle "No" under Surface Soil Finding in the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK_EVALUATION Section below.)
 - No_ (After completing the Surface Soil Rationale and References section below, and the remaining questions in this checklist, circle "Yes" under Surface Soil Finding in the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)

Surface Soil Rationale and References: (Please summarize the rationale for the answers above. Please clearly reference the document name and date as well as the page, table or figure number where any data considered in answering the above questions can be found. In addition, please discuss any site specific information, not specifically prompted by the question(s) above, that would help to clarify and/or qualify the finding. Please add additional pages as necessary.)

Subsurface Soil

- 3 a. Is subsurface soil (found at depths greater than 2 feet from the surface) known or reasonably expected to be contaminated due to releases at or from the facility?
 - Yes_ (Proceed to question 3 b.)
 - No___ (Skip to the Subsurface Soil Rationale and References section. Then complete the remaining questions in this checklist and circle "No" under Subsurface Soil Finding in the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)
- 3 b. Are the contaminated subsurface soils located in a setting where they could be exposed by erosion or that subsurface soil contaminants could be mobilized and transported via groundwater to a surface water body?
 - Yes_ (After completing the Subsurface Soil Rationale and References Section and the remaining questions in this checklist, circle "Yes" under Subsurface Soil Finding under the PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below).
 - No __ engineering controls are in place. (Proceed to question 3c)
- 3 c. Is an institutional control in place to effectively ensure that contaminated soil will not be brought to the surface, as a result of excavation, demolition or other activities and, if applicable, to ensure that engineering controls are maintained and that if contaminated soil is exposed, appropriate measures will be taken to address ecological risk?
 - Yes__ (After completing the Subsurface Soil Rationale and References Section and the remaining questions in this checklist, circle "No" under Subsurface Soil Finding under the PRELIMINARY
 ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)
 - No_ (After completing the Subsurface Soil Rationale and References Section and the remaining questions in this checklist, circle "Yes" under Subsurface Soil Finding under the PRELIMINARY
 ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION Section below.)

Subsurface Soil Rationale and References: (Please summarize the rationale for the answers above. Please clearly reference the document name and date as well as the page, table or figure number where any data considered in answering the above questions can be found. In addition, please discuss any site specific information, not specifically prompted by the question(s) above, that would help to clarify and/or qualify the finding. Please add additional pages as necessary.)

PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL RISK EVALUATION

No_

Based on the i	er Body Finding: nformation provided above, is further evaluation of risks to ecological a contaminants in surface water or sediments of surface water bodies
Yes	(Check "Yes" if the response to <u>any</u> of the questions above regarding Surface Water Bodies is "Yes")
No	(Check "No" if the response to <u>all</u> of the questions above (1a, 1b, and 1c) regarding Surface Water Bodies is "No")
	nformation provided above, is further evaluation of risks to ecological contaminants in surface soil necessary?
	oil Finding: Based on the information provided above, is further risks to ecological receptors from contaminants in subsurface soil
Yes	

Based on the information provided on the preceding pages, check the appropriate

response: The answer was "No" for all three of the findings in this checklist (i.e., the Surface Water Body Finding, the Surface Soil Finding and the Subsurface Soil Finding). Therefore, based on the data considered in this checklist, ecological exposure to contaminants at or from the facility, EPA ID #, located at (street address) in (town and state) is not reasonably expected and further ecological risk assessment does not appear necessary. Please ensure that supporting information used to answer the questions in this checklist is summarized in the "rationale and reference" section on each page. Please also list the document title, as well as the page number, table number or figure number, where the supporting data can be found. Rationale and references should be clear and specific so that the findings of the checklist are transparent and able to be reproduced. Note: Releases from the facility must be adequately characterized, in accordance with EPA guidance, in order to make this determination. This checklist should be revisited if new information, that would alter the checklist findings, becomes available. In addition, the finding that ecological exposure to facility contaminants is not expected is not considered final until a site-wide remedy decision made by EPA or a state environmental agency authorized for RCRA Corrective Action results in the termination of interim status of a facility or satisfaction with the conditions of a hazardous waste operating or post-closure permit. The answer was "Yes" for any of the findings in this checklist (i.e., the Surface Water Body Finding, the Surface Soil Finding and the Subsurface Soil Finding). Therefore, further evaluation of ecological risk is recommended for the facility, EPA ID #____ located at (street address) ______ in (town and state) An EPA or state ecological risk assessor should be involved as early as possible in planning the facility investigation. This checklist can be provided to the ecological risk assessor to focus the ecological risk assessment on the potential exposure pathways. Completed by: (signature) Date (printed name) (title) Locations where References may be found: